

Dual Kadec-Klee norms and the relationships between Wijsman, slice and Mosco convergence

J.M. Borwein¹

Department of Combinatorics and Optimization
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3G1

J. Vanderwerff²

Department of Pure Mathematics
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3G1

Abstract. In this paper, we completely settle several of the open questions regarding the relationships between the three most fundamental forms of set convergence. In particular, it is shown that Wijsman and slice convergence coincide precisely when the weak star and norm topologies agree on the dual sphere. Consequently, a weakly compactly generated Banach space admits a dense set of norms for which Wijsman and slice convergence coincide if and only if it is an Asplund space. We also show that Wijsman convergence implies Mosco convergence precisely when the weak star and Mackey topologies coincide on the dual sphere. A corollary of these results is that given a fixed norm on an Asplund space, Wijsman and slice convergence coincide if and only if Wijsman convergence implies Mosco convergence.

1. Research supported in part by an NSERC research grant.

2. NSERC postdoctoral fellow.

AMS Classification. Primary: 46B20, 46B03, 46N10; Secondary: 46A55.

Key Words: Set convergence, convexity, Kadec-Klee norms, Mosco convergence, slice convergence, Wijsman convergence, Asplund spaces.

0. Introduction.

All Banach spaces considered here are assumed to be real. Let X be an infinite dimensional Banach space with a given norm $\|\cdot\|$. When considering a subspace Y of X , we will always assume it is endowed with the relative norm unless stated otherwise. The ball and sphere of X are defined and denoted as follows: $B_X = \{x : \|x\| \leq 1\}$ and $S_X = \{x : \|x\| = 1\}$. We also use the notation $B_r = \{x : \|x\| \leq r\}$. For $x \in X$, $A, B \subset X$, let $d(x, A) = \inf\{\|x - a\| : a \in A\}$ and let $d(A, B) = \inf\{\|a - b\| : a \in A, b \in B\}$. If $A = \emptyset$, the convention is that $d(x, A) = \infty$; similarly, $d(A, B) = \infty$ if A or B is empty. We are going to consider the following three notions of set convergence. Let C_α, C be closed convex subsets of X . If $\lim_\alpha d(x, C_\alpha) = d(x, C)$ for all $x \in X$, then C_α is said to *converge Wijsman* to C . More restrictively, C_α is said to *converge slice* to C , if $\lim_\alpha d(W, C_\alpha) = d(W, C)$ for all closed bounded convex sets W . We will say C_α *converges Mosco* to C , if the following two conditions are satisfied.

M(i) If $x \in C$, then $d(x, C_\alpha) \rightarrow 0$.

M(ii) If $x_{\alpha_\beta} \in C_{\alpha_\beta}$ for some subnet is such that $\{x_{\alpha_\beta}\}_\beta$ is relatively weakly compact and $x_{\alpha_\beta} \xrightarrow{w} x$, then $x \in C$.

Notice that M(i) and M(ii) reduce to the usual definition for Mosco convergence in the case of sequences (for M(ii) we use that a weakly convergent sequence is relatively weakly compact). Moreover this definition is compatible with the Mosco topology as defined in [Be2]. As is the usual practice, we only consider these notions for closed convex sets. It is also clear that Wijsman, Mosco and slice convergence coincide in finite dimensional spaces, so we will only consider infinite dimensional spaces. As a matter of terminology, we will say that given a fixed norm on X , *Wijsman convergence implies Mosco (slice) convergence* if C_α converges Mosco (slice) to C whenever C_α converges Wijsman to C with respect to the given norm on X (if C_n converges Mosco (slice) to C , whenever C_n converges Wijsman to C , we will say *sequential Wijsman convergence implies Mosco (slice) convergence*).

It is crucial that we stipulate which norm is being used on X when speaking of Wijsman convergence because it depends on the particular norm (see [Be4, BF1, BL]). However, it follows from the definitions that Mosco and slice convergence do not depend on the norm being used. One can also easily check, using the definitions, that slice convergence implies Mosco convergence in every space and they coincide in reflexive spaces. Moreover, if a net of sets converges slice to some set in a Banach space X , then it is not hard to check that the convergence is Wijsman with respect to every equivalent norm; Beer ([Be4]) has

recently shown the converse holds. See [Be3, Be4, BF1, BL, BB1, BB2] for further results and examples.

Historically, the notion of Wijsman convergence was introduced by Wijsman in [W] where it is shown to be a useful tool in finite dimensional spaces. Mosco's fundamental paper [M] on set convergence introduced the concept of Mosco convergence which has proved to be a very useful notion in reflexive spaces. Unfortunately, it has several defects in nonreflexive spaces; see [BB1]. However, a recent paper of Beer ([Be3]) shows that many of the nice properties of Mosco convergence in reflexive spaces are valid for slice convergence in nonreflexive spaces. Because of this and the fact that Wijsman convergence is simpler to check, it is desirable to know when Wijsman convergence implies slice convergence. Recall that [BF1, Theorem 3.1] shows that Wijsman and Mosco convergence coincide if and only if the space is reflexive and the weak and norm topologies coincide on the dual sphere (a topological version of this is proved in [Be2, Theorem 2.5]). This and the fact that Mosco and slice convergence coincide in reflexive spaces leads to the following natural question posed in [BB2]. Do Wijsman and slice convergence coincide whenever the w^* and norm topologies agree on the dual unit sphere? This paper will provide an affirmative answer to this question.

In the first section, we present some basic facts about dual Kadec-Klee norms (which for brevity we call Kadec norms). Let τ denote the Mackey topology on X^* , that is the topology of uniform convergence on weakly compact sets. We will say a norm $\|\cdot\|$ is w^* - τ -Kadec if $\|x_\alpha^*\| \rightarrow \|x^*\|$ and $x_\alpha^* \xrightarrow{w^*} x^*$ imply $x_\alpha^* \xrightarrow{\tau} x^*$; if this holds for sequences, then $\|\cdot\|$ will be called *sequentially w^* - τ -Kadec*. These notions coincide when the dual ball is w^* -sequentially compact (see Corollary 1.2). On the other hand, there are norms that are sequentially w^* - τ -Kadec, but not w^* - τ -Kadec; see Remark 1.5(a). Many of our results will deal with the following property of a norm which is more restrictive than w^* - τ -Kadec; see Remark 1.5(b). A norm $\|\cdot\|$ is said to be w^* -Kadec if $\|x_\alpha - x\| \rightarrow 0$ whenever $\|x_\alpha\| \rightarrow \|x\|$ and $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{w^*} x$; if this holds for sequences, $\|\cdot\|$ is said to be *sequentially w^* -Kadec*.

Section 2 begins by showing that Wijsman convergence has the defect of not being preserved in superspaces while Mosco and slice convergence are. We also show that the relationship between Wijsman and slice convergence is separably and sequentially determined (this allows us to restrict our attention to sequences of sets in separable subspaces in the third section). Some relationships between set convergence, dual Kadec norms and differentiability are also presented in the second section.

The third section contains the main results. It is shown that Wijsman and slice convergence coincide precisely when the dual norm is w^* -Kadec. Let us mention that wide classes of Banach spaces can be renormed so that the dual norm is w^* -Kadec. A Banach space is said to be *weakly compactly generated* (WCG) if it contains a weakly compact set whose linear span is norm dense. It is clear (from the definition) that WCG spaces include all separable and all reflexive spaces. It follows from [F1, Theorem 1] that every WCG Asplund space can be renormed so that the dual norm is w^* -Kadec. If X^* is WCG, then there is a norm on X whose dual norm is w^* -Kadec; see [DGZ, F1, F2] for more and stronger results on renorming. We also give some conditions on the limit set for which one can deduce slice convergence from Wijsman convergence in certain spaces with Fréchet differentiable norms (whose dual norms are not necessarily w^* -Kadec). This will be done by working with functionals in the subdifferentials of distance functions. Recall that the *subdifferential* of a convex function f at x_0 in the domain of f , is defined by $\partial f(x_0) = \{\Lambda \in X^* : \langle \Lambda, x - x_0 \rangle \leq f(x) - f(x_0) \text{ for all } x \in X\}$.

1. Dual Kadec norms.

The purpose of this section is to gather a few facts about dual Kadec norms which we will need later. See also [DS, GM, JH] for some other properties of spaces related to dual Kadec norms.

Proposition 1.1. *For a Banach space X , the following are equivalent.*

- (a) *The dual norm on X^* is w^* - τ -Kadec (w^* -Kadec).*
- (b) *For each $Y \subset X$, the dual norm on Y^* is w^* - τ -Kadec (w^* -Kadec).*
- (c) *For each separable $Y \subset X$, the dual norm on Y^* is sequentially w^* - τ -Kadec (sequentially w^* -Kadec).*

Proof. We prove this for the w^* - τ -Kadec case only. (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b): Suppose Y is a subspace of X and its dual norm $\|\cdot\|$ is not w^* - τ -Kadec. Then there is a weakly compact set K , an $\epsilon > 0$ and a net $y_\alpha^* \xrightarrow{w^*} y^*$ such that $\|y_\alpha^*\| = \|y^*\| = 1$ and

$$\sup_K |y_\alpha^* - y^*| > \epsilon \quad \text{for all } \alpha.$$

Let x_α^* denote a norm preserving extension of y_α^* . By Alaoglu's theorem, for some subnet, one has $x_{\alpha_\beta}^* \xrightarrow{w^*} x^*$ for some $x^* \in B_{X^*}$. Observe that $x^*|_Y = y^*$ and so it follows that $\|x^*\| = 1$ and

$$\sup_K |x_{\alpha_\beta}^* - x^*| > \epsilon \quad \text{for all } \beta.$$

Hence the dual norm on X^* is not w^* - τ -Kadec.

It is clear that (b) $\Rightarrow$ (c), so we prove (c) $\Rightarrow$ (a). Suppose the dual norm $\|\cdot\|$ on X^* is not w^* - τ -Kadec. Thus we can choose a net $\{x_\alpha^*\}$ and a weakly compact set $K \subset X$ such that $x_\alpha^* \xrightarrow{w^*} x^*$, $\|x_\alpha^*\| = \|x^*\| = 1$, and

$$\sup_K |x_\alpha^* - x^*| > \epsilon \quad \text{for all } \alpha \text{ and some } \epsilon > 0.$$

Let $\{u_n\} \subset X$ be such that $\|u_n\| = 1$ and $\langle x^*, u_n \rangle > 1 - \frac{1}{n}$. Let $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 \leq \dots$ be chosen so that $\langle x_\alpha^*, u_n \rangle \geq 1 - \frac{1}{n}$ whenever $\alpha \geq \alpha_n$. Now choose $\{x_i^*\} \subset \{x_\alpha^*\}$ and $\{x_i\} \subset K$ as follows. Let $x_1^* = x_{\alpha_1}^*$ and $x_1 \in K$ be chosen so that $|\langle x_1^* - x^*, x_1 \rangle| > \epsilon$. Suppose $\{x_1^*, x_2^*, \dots, x_{k-1}^*\}$ and $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k-1}\}$ have been chosen such that $|\langle x_j^* - x^*, x_j \rangle| > \epsilon$ for $1 \leq j \leq k-1$. Because $x_\alpha^* \xrightarrow{w^*} x^*$, we can choose $x_k^* = x_\alpha^*$ where $\alpha \geq \alpha_k$ and

$$|\langle x_k^* - x_j^*, x_j \rangle| \geq \epsilon \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \dots, k-1.$$

Now choose $x_k \in K$ such that $|\langle x_k^* - x^*, x_k \rangle| > \epsilon$.

Let $Y = \overline{\text{span}}(\{x_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \cup \{u_i\}_{i=1}^\infty)$. Then Y is separable and $K_1 = K \cap Y$ is a weakly compact subset of Y . Now let $y_i^* = x_i^*|_Y$. Because Y is separable, B_{Y^*} is w^* -sequentially compact and so $y_{i_j}^* \xrightarrow{w^*} y^*$ for some subsequence and some $y^* \in B_{Y^*}$. Observe that

$$\langle y^*, u_n \rangle = \lim_j \langle x_{i_j}^*, u_n \rangle \geq 1 - \frac{1}{n}.$$

Thus it follows that $\|y^*\| = 1$. Moreover, for $n > m$, $|\langle y_n^* - y_m^*, x_m \rangle| \geq \epsilon$; and since $x_m \in K_1$, this means $y_{i_j}^*$ does not converge Mackey to y^* . Thus the dual norm on Y^* is not sequentially w^* - τ -Kadec. ■

Corollary 1.2. *Suppose that B_{X^*} is w^* -sequentially compact. If the dual norm on X^* is sequentially w^* - τ -Kadec (sequentially w^* -Kadec), then it is w^* - τ -Kadec (w^* -Kadec).*

Proof. We prove the w^* - τ -Kadec case only. Using w^* -sequential compactness, one can show as in the proof of (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b) in Proposition 1.1 that the dual norm on Y^* is sequentially w^* - τ -Kadec for each subspace Y of X . Therefore, by Proposition 1.1, the norm on X^* is w^* - τ -Kadec. ■

Recall that a space is said to have the *Schur property* if weakly convergent sequences are norm convergent.

Remark 1.3. (a) *If X has the Schur property, then every dual norm on X^* is w^* - τ -Kadec.*

(b) There are spaces X such that X^* has a dual w^* - τ -Kadec norm, but B_{X^*} is not w^* -sequentially compact.

Proof. (a) Since weakly compact sets are norm compact, it is clear that w^* -convergence is the same as τ -convergence.

(b) This follows from (a) because $X = \ell_1(\Gamma)$ is Schur but B_{X^*} is not w^* -sequentially compact whenever Γ is uncountable (see [Du, p. 48]). ■

A Banach space X is called *sequentially reflexive* if every τ -convergent sequence in X^* is norm convergent (see [Bor, Ø]). It is shown in [Ø] that X is sequentially reflexive if and only if $X \not\supset \ell_1$ (by $X \not\supset \ell_1$, we mean that X does not contain an *isomorphic copy* of ℓ_1). This result provides a nice connection between w^* -Kadec and w^* - τ -Kadec norms.

Theorem 1.4. *For a Banach space X , the following are equivalent.*

- (a) *The dual norm on X^* is w^* -Kadec.*
- (b) *X is Asplund and the dual norm on X^* is sequentially w^* -Kadec.*
- (c) *B_{X^*} is w^* -sequentially compact and the dual norm on X^* is sequentially w^* -Kadec.*
- (d) *B_{X^*} is w^* -sequentially compact, $X \not\supset \ell_1$ and the dual norm on X^* is sequentially w^* - τ -Kadec.*
- (e) *$X \not\supset \ell_1$ and the dual norm on X^* is w^* - τ -Kadec.*

Proof. (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b): Let Y be a separable subspace of X and suppose $\|\cdot\|$ is a dual w^* -Kadec norm on X^* . Let $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a fixed w^* -dense sequence in B_{Y^*} . Now let $f \in S_{Y^*}$ be arbitrary. For some $\{f_j\}$ we have $f_j \xrightarrow{w^*} f$. According to Proposition 1.1, $\|\cdot\|$ is sequentially w^* -Kadec on Y^* , hence it follows that $\|f_j - f\| \rightarrow 0$. Thus Y^* is separable since its sphere has a countable norm dense subset. Consequently X is an Asplund space (see [Ph, Theorem 2.34]). This shows (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b). Now (b) $\Rightarrow$ (c) follows from the fact that Asplund spaces have w^* -sequentially compact dual balls ([Di, p. 230]). According to Corollary 1.2, (c) $\Rightarrow$ (a) and hence (c) $\Rightarrow$ (b) which means $X \not\supset \ell_1$, thus (c) $\Rightarrow$ (d). Moreover, Corollary 1.2 shows (d) $\Rightarrow$ (e). Finally, we show (e) $\Rightarrow$ (a). By [Ø], if $X \not\supset \ell_1$, then X is sequentially reflexive. Combining this with Proposition 1.1, shows that for every subspace Y of X , the dual norm on Y^* is sequentially w^* -Kadec. Invoking Proposition 1.1 again, shows that the dual norm on X^* is w^* -Kadec. ■

As a note of comparison with weak Kadec properties, if X is separable and $X \not\supset \ell_1$, then sequentially weak Kadec norms are weak Kadec while on ℓ_1 there are sequentially weak Kadec norms that are not weak Kadec; see [Tr]. Also, several spaces have w^* -sequentially

compact dual balls. Indeed, Asplund, WCG and more generally Gateaux Differentiability spaces have w^* -sequentially dual balls; see [Di, Chapter XIII] and [LP].

Remark 1.5. (a) *There is a norm on ℓ_∞ whose dual norm is sequentially w^* -Kadec but not w^* - τ -Kadec.*

(b) *No dual norm on ℓ_1^* is sequentially w^* -Kadec, but every dual norm on ℓ_1^* is w^* - τ -Kadec.*

Proof. (a) Since w^* -convergent sequences in ℓ_∞^* are w -convergent ([Di, p. 103]) and since ℓ_∞ has the Dunford-Pettis property ([Di, p. 113]), it follows that w^* -convergent sequences in ℓ_∞^* are τ -convergent (see Proposition 2.5). Thus the dual of every norm on ℓ_∞ is sequentially w^* -Kadec. Let $\|\cdot\|$ be an equivalent norm on c_0 whose dual is not sequentially w^* -Kadec (see [BFa]). It follows from Theorem 1.4 that the dual norm of $\|\cdot\|$ is not sequentially w^* - τ -Kadec. Now let $\|\cdot\|$ denote the second dual of this norm on ℓ_∞ . Then the dual of $\|\cdot\|$ is not w^* - τ -Kadec on ℓ_∞^* by Proposition 1.1.

(b) This is clear from Remark 1.3(a) and Theorem 1.4. ■

Finally, let us mention that the following is not clear to us: if the dual norm on X^* is sequentially w^* -Kadec, then must it be w^* -Kadec? This, of course is true if the dual ball is w^* -sequentially compact (Theorem 1.4). So this question is equivalent to: if the dual norm is sequentially w^* -Kadec, is the dual ball w^* -sequentially compact?

2. Basic properties of set convergence.

One of the nice things about Wijsman convergence is the simplicity of its definition. However, this leads to the drawback that Wijsman convergence is not necessarily preserved by superspaces.

Proposition 2.1. (a) *Let Y be a Banach space and suppose C_α converges slice (Mosco) to C in Y . If X is a superspace of Y , then C_α converges slice (Mosco) to C in X .*

(b) *Wijsman convergence in X is not necessarily preserved in $X \times \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. (a) It is clear from the definition that this holds for Mosco convergence. We will prove that slice convergence is preserved in superspaces. Suppose that $C_\alpha, C \subset Y$, where Y is a subspace of X and that C_α does not converge slice to C in X . We will show that C_α does not converge slice to C in Y . We may suppose C_α converges Wijsman to C in Y , since otherwise we are done. Given any set $B \subset X$ and $\epsilon > 0$, we can choose $b \in B$ and $c \in C$ such that $\|b - c\| \leq d(B, C) + \epsilon$. By Wijsman convergence, $d(c, C_\alpha) \rightarrow d(c, C) = 0$. Hence $\limsup d(B, C_\alpha) \leq \limsup(\|b - c\| + d(c, C_\alpha)) \leq d(B, C) + \epsilon$. Thus because C_α

does not converge slice to C , by passing to a subnet if necessary, we find a bounded closed convex $W \subset X$ such that

$$d(W, C_\alpha) + 3\delta \leq d(W, C) \quad \text{for all } \alpha \text{ and some } \delta > 0.$$

Let $r = d(W, C) - 2\delta$. Then $(W + B_r) \cap C_\alpha \neq \emptyset$ for all α , while $(W + B_{r+\delta}) \cap C = \emptyset$. Using the separation theorem, we find a $\Lambda \in S_{X^*}$ such that

$$\sup\{\langle \Lambda, x \rangle : x \in W + B_{r+\delta}\} \leq \inf\{\langle \Lambda, x \rangle : x \in C\}.$$

Let $a = \sup\{\langle \Lambda, x \rangle : x \in W + B_r\}$, then

$$a + \delta = \sup\{\langle \Lambda, x \rangle : x \in W + B_{r+\delta}\} \leq \inf\{\langle \Lambda, x \rangle : x \in C\} \quad (2.1)$$

and

$$W + B_r \subset \{x : \langle \Lambda, x \rangle \leq a\}.$$

Now let $m > 0$ be chosen such that $W + B_r \subset B_m$. Because $(W + B_r) \cap C_\alpha \neq \emptyset$, there exists $y_\alpha \in C_\alpha \subset Y$ such that

$$y_\alpha \in \{y \in Y : \langle \Lambda, y \rangle \leq a\} \cap B_m.$$

We set $W_1 = \{y \in Y : \langle \Lambda, y \rangle \leq a\} \cap B_m$. Hence, $W_1 \cap C_\alpha \neq \emptyset$ for all α . However, according to (2.1), $d(W_1, C) \geq \delta$ and so C_α does not converge slice to C in Y .

(b) Let X be c_0 endowed with the norm $\| \cdot \|$ which is defined for $x = (x_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ as follows:

$$\|x\| = |x_0| \vee |x_1| \vee \left(\sup_{n \geq 2} |x_n + x_1| \right).$$

Let $Y = \{x \in X : x_0 = x_1\}$ and define $\hat{f}_n \in X^*$ by

$$\hat{f}_n(x) = x_1 + x_n \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{f}_\infty(x) = x_1.$$

Then

$$\|\hat{f}_n\| = \sup\{x_1 + x_n : |x_1 + x_n| \leq 1, |x_1| \leq 1\} = 1, \quad \text{and}$$

$$\|\hat{f}_\infty\| = \sup\{x_1 : |x_1 + x_n| \leq 1, |x_1| \leq 1\} = 1.$$

Now $\hat{f}_n(x) \rightarrow \hat{f}_\infty(x)$ for all x since $x_n \rightarrow 0$. It follows directly that $\hat{f}_n^{-1}(1)$ converges Wijsman to $\hat{f}_\infty^{-1}(1)$; see [Be1, Theorem 4.3].

Let $f_n = \hat{f}_n|_Y$, then $\|f_n\| = \|f_\infty\| = 1$, and so similarly it follows that

$f_n^{-1}(1)$ converges Wijsman to $f_\infty^{-1}(1)$ in Y .

However, $f_n^{-1}(1)$ does not converge Wijsman to $f_\infty^{-1}(1)$ in X . Indeed, consider $z^0 = (0, \frac{1}{2}, 0, 0, \dots)$ and $z^n = \frac{1}{2}e_0 + \frac{1}{2}e_1 + \frac{1}{2}e_n$. Then $z^n \in f_n^{-1}(1)$ and

$$\frac{1}{2} = \|z^0 - z^n\| \geq d(z^0, f_n^{-1}(1)).$$

On the other hand, if $x = (x_i)_{i=0}^\infty \in f_\infty^{-1}(1)$, then $x_0 = x_1 = 1$ and consequently one has $\|x - z^0\| \geq |x_0| = 1$ which means $d(z^0, f_\infty^{-1}(1)) \geq 1$. $\blacksquare$

A partial redress to Proposition 2.1(b) will be given in Corollary 3.3. We next show that the relationship between Wijsman and slice (Mosco) convergence is separably and sequentially determined.

Theorem 2.2. *Suppose C_α converges Wijsman but not slice (Mosco) to C in some subspace E of X , then there is a separable subspace Y of E and a subsequence C_{α_n} such that $C_{\alpha_n} \cap Y$ converges Wijsman but not slice (Mosco) to $C \cap Y$ as subsets of Y .*

Proof. Since C_α converges Wijsman to C in E , as in the proof of Proposition 2.1, $\limsup_\alpha d(B, C_\alpha) \leq d(B, C)$ for any $B \subset E$. Thus, because C_α does not converge slice to C , by passing to a subnet if necessary, there is a bounded closed convex subset W of E and a $\delta > 0$ such that

$$d(W, C_\alpha) + \delta < d(W, C) \quad \text{for all } \alpha. \quad (2.2)$$

Let Z be an arbitrary separable subspace of E and set $Z_1 = Z$. Fix a dense subset $\{z_{1,i}\}_{i=1}^\infty$ of Z_1 and choose α_1 such that

$$d(z_{1,1}, C) - 1 < d(z_{1,1}, C_{\alpha_1}) < d(z_{1,1}, C) + 1. \quad (2.3)$$

Using (2.2) and (2.3), one can choose $w_1 \in W$, $c_1 \in C_{\alpha_1}$, $x_{1,1}^1 \in C_{\alpha_1}$ and $y_{1,1}^1 \in C$ such that:

$$\|w_1 - c_1\| \leq d(W, C) - \delta;$$

$$\|z_{1,1} - x_{1,1}^1\| \leq d(z_{1,1}, C) + 1;$$

$$\|z_{1,1} - y_{1,1}^1\| \leq d(z_{1,1}, C) + 1.$$

Suppose $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 \leq \dots \leq \alpha_{n-1}$, $\{z_{i,j}\}_{j=1}^\infty$, c_i, w_i , for $i \leq n-1$ and $\{y_{i,j}^k\}, \{x_{i,j}^k\}$ for $i, j \leq k$, $k \leq n-1$ have been chosen. Then set

$$Z_n = \overline{\text{span}}(\{Z_{n-1} \cup \{y_{i,j}^n\} \cup \{x_{i,j}^n\} \cup \{c_n\} \cup \{w_n\} : i \leq n, j \leq n\}). \quad (2.4)$$

Fix a dense collection $\{z_{n,i}\}_{i=1}^\infty \subset Z_n$ and choose $\alpha_n \geq \alpha_{n-1}$ such that

$$d(z_{i,j}, C) - \frac{1}{n} < d(z_{i,j}, C_{\alpha_n}) < d(z_{i,j}, C) + \frac{1}{n} \quad \text{whenever } i \leq n, j \leq n. \quad (2.5)$$

Using this, for $i \leq n, j \leq n$ we choose $x_{i,j}^n \in C_{\alpha_n}$ and $y_{i,j}^n \in C$ such that

$$\|x_{i,j}^n - z_{i,j}\| \leq d(z_{i,j}, C) + \frac{1}{n}; \quad (2.6)$$

$$\|y_{i,j}^n - z_{i,j}\| \leq d(z_{i,j}, C) + \frac{1}{n}. \quad (2.7)$$

According to (2.2), let $w_n \in W$ and $c_n \in C_{\alpha_n}$ be chosen so that

$$\|w_n - c_n\| \leq d(W, C) - \delta. \quad (2.8)$$

Finally let Y be the norm closure of $\cup_{n=1}^\infty Z_n$.

We now show that $C_{\alpha_n} \cap Y$ converges Wijsman but not slice to $C \cap Y$ as subsets of Y . Let $\epsilon > 0$ and let $y \in Y$. Since $\cup_n Z_n$ is norm dense in Y , for some $z_{i,j}$ we have $\|z_{i,j} - y\| < \epsilon$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} d(y, C) &\leq d(y, C \cap Y) \\ &\leq \|y - z_{i,j}\| + d(z_{i,j}, C \cap Y) \\ &\leq \epsilon + \liminf_n \|z_{i,j} - y_{i,j}^n\| \\ &\leq \epsilon + \liminf_n \left(d(z_{i,j}, C) + \frac{1}{n} \right) \quad [\text{by (2.7)}] \\ &\leq \epsilon + d(z_{i,j}, C) \\ &\leq 2\epsilon + d(y, C). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $d(y, C \cap Y) = d(y, C)$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_n d(y, C_{\alpha_n} \cap Y) &\geq -\|y - z_{i,j}\| + \liminf_n d(z_{i,j}, C_{\alpha_n}) \\ &\geq -\epsilon + \liminf_n \left(d(z_{i,j}, C) - \frac{1}{n} \right) \quad [\text{by (2.5)}] \\ &= d(z_{i,j}, C) - \epsilon \geq d(y, C) - 2\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\liminf_n d(y, C_{\alpha_n} \cap Y) \geq d(y, C)$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_n d(y, C_{\alpha_n} \cap Y) &\leq \|y - z_{i,j}\| + \limsup_n \|z_{i,j} - x_{i,j}^n\| \\ &\leq \epsilon + \limsup_n \left(d(z_{i,j}, C) + \frac{1}{n} \right) \quad [\text{by (2.6)}] \\ &\leq 2\epsilon + d(y, C). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, $\lim_n d(y, C_{\alpha_n} \cap Y) = d(y, C) = d(y, C \cap Y)$. So $C_{\alpha_n} \cap Y$ converges Wijsman to $C \cap Y$ in Y .

However, for $W_1 = W \cap Y$, we have $w_n \in W_1$ and $c_n \in C_{\alpha_n} \cap Y$ for all n (as chosen in (2.8) and notice that $w_n, c_n \in Y$ by (2.4)). Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} d(W_1, C \cap Y) &\geq d(W, C) \\ &\geq \|w_n - c_n\| + \delta \quad [\text{by (2.8)}] \\ &\geq d(W_1, C_{\alpha_n}). \end{aligned}$$

So $C_{\alpha_n} \cap Y$ does not converge slice to $C \cap Y$ in Y .

The Mosco case can be proved in a similar manner. It is clear that M(i) holds because of Wijsman convergence. If M(ii) fails, then there is a net $y_\beta \subset C_{\alpha_\beta}$ such that $y_\beta \xrightarrow{w} y$ where $y \notin C$ and $\{y_\beta\}$ is contained in a weakly compact set. Now one can strictly separate y from C , thus taking a further subnet, we may assume that no subsequence of $\{y_\beta\}$ has a limit point in C . Thus using the above construction and weak sequential compactness, one can obtain the result for Mosco convergence. $\blacksquare$

The following proposition, which is based on ideas from [Be1], relates set convergence to properties of the dual norm. If Wijsman convergence of L_α to L implies Mosco convergence of L_α to L for any net (sequence) of sets $L_\alpha = \{x : \langle x_\alpha^*, x \rangle = a\}$, $L = \{x : \langle x^*, x \rangle = a\}$ where $x_\alpha^*, x^* \in X^*$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}$, then we will say *Wijsman convergence implies Mosco convergence for (sequences of) level sets of functionals*.

Proposition 2.3 (a) *If in X , Wijsman convergence implies Mosco convergence for (sequences of) level sets of functionals, then the dual norm on X^* is (sequentially) w^* - τ -Kadec.*

(b) *If in X , Wijsman convergence implies slice convergence for (sequences of) level sets of functionals, then the dual norm on X^* is (sequentially) w^* -Kadec.*

Proof. We only prove (a) for nets since the other part is similar and is essentially in [BF1, Theorem 3.1]. Moreover, (b) may be essentially found in [Be1, Be4].

Suppose the dual norm is not w^* - τ -Kadec, then we can find $x_\alpha^*, x^* \in S_{X^*}$ such that $x_\alpha^* \xrightarrow{w^*} x^*$ but $x_\alpha^* \not\xrightarrow{\tau} x^*$. Let $C_\alpha = \{x \in X : \langle x_\alpha^*, x \rangle = 1\}$ and $C = \{x \in X : \langle x^*, x \rangle = 1\}$. Since $d(x, C_\alpha) = |\langle x_\alpha^*, x \rangle - 1|$, it follows that C_α converges Wijsman to C .

We now proceed as in the proof of [BF1, Theorem 3.1]: by passing to a subnet if necessary, there is a weakly compact set $K \subset B_X$ and $\{x_\alpha\} \subset K$ such that $|\langle x_\alpha^* - x^*, x_\alpha \rangle| \geq \epsilon$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. Let $x_0 \in X$ be such that $\|x_0\| \leq 3$ and $\langle x^*, x_0 \rangle > 2$. Now

$\langle x_\alpha^*, x_0 \rangle \rightarrow \langle x^*, x_0 \rangle$ and so by considering only a tail of the net we may assume $\langle x_\alpha^*, x_0 \rangle \geq 2$ for all α . Consider $v_\alpha = x_0 + x_\alpha$. Then $\langle x_\alpha^*, v_\alpha \rangle \geq 1$. Since $\|v_\alpha\| \leq 4$, we can choose $\frac{1}{4} \leq \lambda_\alpha \leq 1$ such that $\langle x_\alpha^*, \lambda_\alpha v_\alpha \rangle = 1$. By passing to a subnet we have $\lambda_{\alpha_\beta} \rightarrow \lambda$ where $\frac{1}{4} \leq \lambda \leq 1$ and $v_{\alpha_\beta} \xrightarrow{w} v$ where $\|v\| \leq 4$. Since $\langle x_\alpha^*, x_0 \rangle \rightarrow \langle x^*, x_0 \rangle$, it follows that

$$\liminf_{\beta} |1 - \langle x^*, \lambda_{\alpha_\beta} v_{\alpha_\beta} \rangle| = \liminf_{\beta} |\langle x_{\alpha_\beta}^* - x^*, \lambda_{\alpha_\beta} v_{\alpha_\beta} \rangle| \geq \liminf_{\beta} \lambda_{\alpha_\beta} \epsilon \geq \frac{\epsilon}{4}.$$

Now, $\langle x^*, \lambda_{\alpha_\beta} v_{\alpha_\beta} \rangle \rightarrow \langle x^*, \lambda v \rangle$ and so we have $|1 - \langle x^*, \lambda v \rangle| \geq \frac{\epsilon}{4}$. Consequently, $\lambda v \notin C$ and so M(ii) fails. This completes the proof. $\blacksquare$

Corollary 2.4. *Suppose in each separable subspace of X that sequential Wijsman convergence implies Mosco (slice) convergence, then the dual norm on X^* is w^* - τ -Kadec (w^* -Kadec).*

Proof. This follows from Proposition 2.3 and Theorem 2.2 (or Proposition 1.1). $\blacksquare$

The next two results show a connection between set convergence and differentiability. Recall that a function is said to be *weak Hadamard differentiable* at a point if its Gateaux derivative exists at the point and is uniform on weakly compact sets. The following proposition shows that this notion is related to Wijsman and Mosco convergence in non-Asplund spaces. Indeed, notice that property (*) below ensures that X contains an isomorphic copy of ℓ_1 ; see [Ø, BFa].

Proposition 2.5. *Let X be a Banach space, then the following are equivalent.*

- (a) *For every equivalent norm on X , Wijsman convergence implies Mosco convergence for sequences of level sets of functionals.*
- (b) *The following property is satisfied.*

$$\langle x_n^*, x_n \rangle \rightarrow \langle x^*, x \rangle \text{ whenever } x_n^* \xrightarrow{w^*} x^* \text{ and } x_n \xrightarrow{w} x. \quad (*)$$

(That is, w^* -convergent sequences in X^* are τ -convergent.)

- (c) *Weak Hadamard and Gateaux differentiability coincide for continuous convex functions on X .*

Proof. The equivalence of (b) and (c) follows from the results of [BFa]; see also [BFV].

(a) $\Rightarrow$ (b): Suppose (*) fails, thus we can find $x_n^* \xrightarrow{w^*} x^*$ and $x_n \xrightarrow{w} x$ but $|\langle x_n^*, x_n \rangle - \langle x^*, x \rangle| \geq \epsilon$ for all n and some $\epsilon > 0$. We now show that X admits an equivalent norm whose dual is not sequentially w^* - τ -Kadec. Notice that we may assume $\|x_n^*\| \leq 1$ for all n . If $\|x^*\| = 1$, then $\|\cdot\|$ is not sequentially w^* - τ -Kadec. So suppose $\|x^*\| < 1$. We may

assume $x^* = 0$ and that $\|x_n^*\| \leq 1$ for all n . Now let $y \in X$ satisfy $\|y\| = 1$. By replacing y with $-y$ if necessary, we have $\langle x_j^*, y \rangle \leq 0$ for all $j \in J$ where J is an infinite subset of $\mathbb{N}$. Now choose $y^* \in X^*$ satisfying $\langle y^*, y \rangle = \|y^*\| = 1$. Define a convex w^* -compact subset of X^* by

$$B = \{\Lambda \in X^* : |\langle \Lambda, y \rangle| \leq 1\} \cap \{\Lambda \in X^* : \|\Lambda\| \leq 2\}.$$

Let $\|\cdot\|$ denote the dual norm on X^* whose unit ball is B . Observe that $\|y^* + x^*\| = 1$ and $\|y^* + x_j^*\| \leq 1$ for all $j \in J$. Hence $\|\cdot\|$ is not sequentially w^* - τ -Kadec since $y^* + x_j^* \xrightarrow{w^*} y^* + x^*$ but $\langle y^* + x_j^*, x_j \rangle \not\rightarrow \langle y^* + x^*, x \rangle$. Thus (a) does not hold by Proposition 2.3(a).

(b) $\Rightarrow$ (a): Let $\|\cdot\|$ be any equivalent norm on X . If C_n converges Wijsman to C where $C_n = \{x : \langle x_n^*, x \rangle = \alpha\}$ and $C = \{x : \langle x^*, x \rangle = \alpha\}$. Then by [Be1, Theorem 4.3] $x_n^* \xrightarrow{w^*} x^*$ and $\|x_n^*\| \rightarrow \|x^*\|$. Now suppose $x_j \in C_j$ for $j \in J \subset \mathbb{N}$ and $x_j \xrightarrow{w} x$. By property (*), we have $\langle x_j^*, x_j \rangle \rightarrow \langle x^*, x \rangle$ which means $\langle x^*, x \rangle = \alpha$ and $x \in C$. Thus M(ii) holds. Since M(i) always holds in the presence of Wijsman convergence, we are done. ■

Corollary 2.6. *Suppose that every separable subspace of X is contained in a complemented subspace whose dual ball is w^* -sequentially compact. Then the following are equivalent.*

- (a) *For every equivalent norm on X , Wijsman convergence implies Mosco convergence for sequences of level sets of functionals.*
- (b) *X has the Schur property.*

Proof. (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b): This follows from Proposition 2.5 and [BFV, Corollary 3.5].

(b) $\Rightarrow$ (a): This is always true. ■

The condition in the preceding corollary is, of course, satisfied in all spaces whose dual balls are w^* -sequentially compact (in particular WCG spaces) and in much more general cases; see [BFV]. In addition, there are many Grothendieck $C(K)$ spaces which satisfy property (*) but are not Schur; see [BFV] and the references therein.

3. Dual Kadec norms and set convergence.

The proof of our main result will use the following proposition which is essentially due to Attouch and Beer (part (a)—for sequences—is contained in [AB, Theorem 3.1]). We will also need the following intermediate notion of set convergence. For closed convex sets C_α, C , we will say C_α *converges weak compact gap* to C , if $d(W, C_\alpha) \rightarrow d(W, C)$ for all convex weakly compact subsets W of X .

Proposition 3.1. Suppose C_α and C are closed convex sets in a Banach space X . Consider the following three conditions:

- (i) if $x_0 \in C$, then $d(x_0, C_\alpha) \rightarrow 0$;
- (ii) if $x_0^* \in S_{X^*}$ attains its supremum on C , then there exist $x_\alpha^* \in B_{X^*}$ such that $\|x_\alpha^* - x_0^*\| \rightarrow 0$ and

$$\limsup_{\alpha} \left\{ \sup_{C_\alpha} x_\alpha^* \right\} \leq \sup_C x_0^*;$$

- (iii) if $x_0^* \in S_{X^*}$ attains its supremum on C , then there exist $x_\alpha^* \in B_{X^*}$ such that $x_\alpha^* \xrightarrow{\tau} x_0^*$, and

$$\limsup_{\alpha} \left\{ \sup_{C_\alpha} x_\alpha^* \right\} \leq \sup_C x_0^*.$$

- (a) If (i) and (ii) hold, then C_α converges slice to C .
- (b) If (i) and (iii) hold, then C_α converges weak compact gap to C .

Proof. We prove only (b) since the proof of (a) is almost identical. Let W be a weakly compact convex set in X . According to (i), $\limsup_{\alpha} d(W, C_\alpha) \leq d(W, C)$. So we show that $\liminf_{\alpha} d(W, C_\alpha) \geq d(W, C)$. If $d(W, C) = 0$, there is nothing more to do, so suppose $d(W, C) > 0$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ satisfy $2\epsilon < d(W, C)$ and set $r = d(W, C) - 2\epsilon$. By the separation theorem, there exists $\Lambda \in S_{X^*}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup\{\langle \Lambda, x \rangle : x \in C\} &\leq \inf\{\langle \Lambda, x \rangle : x \in W + B_{r+\epsilon}\} \\ &= \inf\{\langle \Lambda, x \rangle : x \in W + B_r\} - \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

By a general version of the Bishop-Phelps theorem ([BP, Theorem 2]), there is an $x_0^* \in S_{X^*}$ which attains its supremum on C and strictly separates C and $W + B_r$ (one can also obtain this from the Brøndsted-Rockafellar theorem [Ph, Theorem 3.18]). Thus

$$\inf_W x_0^* - \sup_C x_0^* \geq r.$$

Let x_α^* be given by (iii) and let α_0 be such that

$$\sup_{C_\alpha} x_\alpha^* \leq \sup_C x_0^* + \epsilon, \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_W x_\alpha^* \geq \inf_W x_0^* - \epsilon \quad \text{for } \alpha \geq \alpha_0.$$

From this it follows that

$$d(C_\alpha, W) \geq \inf_W x_\alpha^* - \sup_{C_\alpha} x_\alpha^* \geq r - 2\epsilon \geq d(W, C) - 4\epsilon \quad \text{for } \alpha \geq \alpha_0.$$

Since $\epsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, we are done. ■

With Proposition 3.1 at our disposal, we are now ready for our main result.

Theorem 3.2. *For a Banach space X , the following are equivalent.*

- (a) *The dual norm on X^* is w^* -Kadec.*
- (b) *Sequential Wijsman and slice convergence coincide in every separable subspace of X .*
- (c) *Wijsman and slice convergence coincide in every subspace of X .*

Proof. (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b): Let Z be any separable subspace of X . Suppose that C_n converges Wijsman to C as subsets of Z . We wish to show that (i) and (ii) in Proposition 3.1 hold. Clearly (i) follows from Wijsman convergence so we show (ii). Let $z_0^* \in S_{X^*}$ attain its supremum on C , say $\sup_C z_0^* = \langle z_0^*, z_0 \rangle$ where $z_0 \in C$.

Let $\alpha_0 = \langle z_0^*, z_0 \rangle$ and let $L = \{z : \langle z_0^*, z \rangle = \alpha_0 + 1\}$. Since Z and hence L is separable, we can choose a sequence of compact convex sets $\{K_n\}$ such that $K_n \subset L$ for each n , $K_1 \subset K_2 \subset K_3 \subset \dots$, $d(K_n, z_0) < 1 + \frac{1}{n}$ and

$$L \text{ is the norm closure of } \cup_{n=1}^{\infty} K_n. \quad (3.1)$$

Since compact sets have finite ϵ -nets and since C_n converges Wijsman to C , we deduce that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} d(K_n, C_j) = d(K_n, C) \quad \text{for each } n$$

(in other words, Wijsman convergence is precisely compact gap convergence). Thus we may choose $j_1 < j_2 < j_3 < \dots$ such that

$$d(z_0, C_j) < \frac{1}{n} \quad \text{and} \quad 1 - \frac{1}{n} < d(K_n, C_j) < 1 + \frac{1}{n} \quad \text{for } j \geq j_n. \quad (3.2)$$

It follows that $(1 - \frac{1}{n})B_Z \cap (K_n - C_j) = \emptyset$ for $j \geq j_n$. Thus by the separation theorem, there exists $\Lambda_{n,j} \in S_{Z^*}$ such that

$$\sup\{\langle \Lambda_{n,j}, z \rangle : z \in (1 - \frac{1}{n})B_Z\} \leq \inf\{\langle \Lambda_{n,j}, z \rangle : z \in K_n - C_j\} \quad \text{for } j \geq j_n.$$

This implies

$$\sup_{C_j} \Lambda_{n,j} + (1 - \frac{1}{n}) \leq \min_{K_n} \Lambda_{n,j} \quad \text{for } j \geq j_n. \quad (3.3)$$

Now set $z_j^* = 0$ for $j < j_1$ and

$$z_j^* = \Lambda_{n,j} \quad \text{for } j_n \leq j < j_{n+1}.$$

Claim. $z_j^* \xrightarrow{w^*} z_0^*$.

Assume temporarily that the claim is true. Because $d(z_0, K_n) < 1 + \frac{1}{n}$, it follows that

$$\min_{K_n} z_j^* < \langle z_j^*, z_0 \rangle + (1 + \frac{1}{n}). \quad (3.4)$$

For $j \in \mathbb{N}$, let n_j denote the number n such that $j_n \leq j < j_{n+1}$. Thus by (3.3) and (3.4) one has

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{C_j} z_j^* + (1 - \frac{1}{n_j}) &\leq \min_{K_{n_j}} z_j^* \\ &< \langle z_j^*, z_0 \rangle + (1 + \frac{1}{n_j}). \end{aligned}$$

In other words,

$$\sup_{C_j} z_j^* < \langle z_j^*, z_0 \rangle + \frac{2}{n_j}.$$

Since $\langle z_j^*, z_0 \rangle \rightarrow \langle z_0^*, z_0 \rangle = \sup_C z_0^*$, this immediately yields

$$\limsup_j \{ \sup_{C_j} z_j^* \} \leq \sup_C z_0^*.$$

Moreover, by Proposition 1.1, the dual norm on Z^* is w^* -Kadec, hence $\|z_j^* - z_0^*\| \rightarrow 0$. Thus (ii) holds provided our claim is true.

Let us now prove that the claim is true by showing every subsequence of $\{z_j^*\}$ has a subsequence which converges w^* to z_0^* . By abuse of notation, let $\{z_{j'}^*\}$ denote an arbitrary subsequence of $\{z_j^*\}$. From the w^* -sequential compactness of B_{Z^*} , by passing to another subsequence if necessary, we have $z_{j'}^* \xrightarrow{w^*} \Lambda$ for some $\Lambda \in B_{Z^*}$. We now show that $\|\Lambda\| = 1$. Again, we use n_j to denote the n such that $j_n \leq j < j_{n+1}$; because $d(z_0, C_j) \leq \frac{1}{n}$ for $j \geq j_n$, it follows that

$$\sup_{C_j} z_j^* \geq \langle z_j^*, z_0 \rangle - \frac{1}{n_j}.$$

Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $z \in K_m$ be fixed. Because $z \in K_n$ for $n \geq m$, the above inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Lambda, z - z_0 \rangle &= \lim_{j'} \langle z_{j'}^*, z - z_0 \rangle \\ &\geq \liminf_j \left(\min_{K_{n_j}} z_j^* - \left(\sup_{C_j} z_j^* + \frac{1}{n_j} \right) \right) \\ &\geq \liminf_j \left(1 - \frac{1}{n_j} - \frac{1}{n_j} \right) \quad [\text{by (3.3)}] \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we have

$$\min_{K_m} \Lambda \geq \langle \Lambda, z_0 \rangle + 1 \quad \text{for all } m \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (3.5)$$

Since $\lim_n d(K_n, z_0) \rightarrow 1$, it also follows that $\|\Lambda\| = 1$.

It now suffices to show that $\Lambda = z_0^*$. Let $H = \{z : \langle z_0^*, z \rangle \geq 0\}$. We claim that $\langle \Lambda, z \rangle \geq 0$ for all $z \in H$. So suppose that $\langle \Lambda, h \rangle \leq -\delta$ for some $\delta > 0$ and some $h \in H$ with $\|h\| \leq 1$. Now consider $z_0 + h$, then $\alpha_0 \leq \langle z_0^*, z_0 + h \rangle \leq 1 + \alpha_0$ and so $d(z_0 + h, L) \leq 1$. Thus by (3.1), we can find $\tilde{z} \in K_m$ for some m such that $\|\tilde{z} - (z_0 + h)\| \leq 1 + \frac{\delta}{2}$. Hence it follows that

$$\langle \Lambda, \tilde{z} \rangle \leq \|\tilde{z} - (z_0 + h)\| + \langle \Lambda, z_0 + h \rangle \leq (1 + \frac{\delta}{2}) + \langle \Lambda, z_0 + h \rangle \leq \langle \Lambda, z_0 \rangle + 1 - \frac{\delta}{2}.$$

This contradicts (3.5). Therefore $\langle \Lambda, h \rangle \geq 0$ for all $h \in H$. But since $\|\Lambda\| = \|z_0^*\| = 1$, this means $\Lambda = z_0^*$. This shows that the claim holds and thus (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b).

Now, (b) $\Rightarrow$ (c) follows from Theorem 2.2 and (c) $\Rightarrow$ (a) is a consequence of Proposition 2.3(b). ■

From Theorem 3.2 and Proposition 2.1(a) we immediately obtain

Corollary 3.3. *If the dual norm on X^* is w^* -Kadec and C_α converges Wijsman to C in X , then C_α converges slice to C in any superspace of X .*

We've also essentially proved the following variant of [AB, Theorem 3.1].

Remark 3.4. *Suppose X is a separable Banach space, then C_n converges Wijsman to C if and only if the following two conditions hold.*

- (i) *If $x_0 \in C$, then there exist $x_n \in C_n$ such that $\|x_n - x_0\| \rightarrow 0$.*
- (ii) *If $x_0 \in S_{X^*}$ attains its supremum on C , then there exist $x_n^* \in B_{X^*}$ such that $x_n^* \xrightarrow{w^*} x_0^*$ and $\limsup_n \{\sup_{C_n} x_n^*\} \leq \sup_C x_0^*$.*

Proof. If (i) and (ii) hold, then the proof of Proposition 3.1 shows that C_n converges Wijsman to C (take W to be an arbitrary singleton). Conversely, (i) follows directly from Wijsman convergence; moreover the z_j^* 's constructed in the proof of Theorem 3.2 satisfy (ii) with $z_0^* = x_0^*$ (the w^* -Kadec property was used only to transform w^* into norm convergence in (ii) which by Proposition 3.1(a) then yields slice convergence). ■

Another way of stating Theorem 3.2 is that Wijsman (compact gap) convergence coincides with slice (bounded gap) convergence precisely when the dual norm is w^* -Kadec. The analog for Wijsman and weak compact gap convergence is also valid.

Theorem 3.5. *If X is a Banach space, the following are equivalent.*

- (a) *The dual norm on X^* is w^* - τ -Kadec.*
- (b) *For each subspace Y of X , Wijsman and weak compact gap convergence coincide.*
- (c) *Wijsman convergence implies Mosco convergence in X .*
- (d) *For each separable subspace Y in X , Wijsman convergence implies Mosco convergence for sequences of level sets of functionals.*

Proof. (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b): Let Y be a separable subspace of X . According to Proposition 1.1, the dual norm on Y^* is w^* - τ -Kadec. Using this with Remark 3.4 and Proposition 3.1(b) shows that Wijsman and weak compact gap convergence coincide in Y . Combining this with a Wijsman versus weak compact gap variant of Theorem 2.2 (the same proof works) shows that (b) holds. To prove (b) $\Rightarrow$ (c), observe first that M(i) clearly holds. We now show M(ii): let $x_\beta \in C_\beta$ for some subnet and suppose $\{x_\beta\}$ is relatively weakly compact. If $x_\beta \xrightarrow{w} x$ and $x \notin C$, then there is an open halfspace containing x and a tail of $\{x_\beta\}$ which is strictly separated from C . Let W be the closed convex hull of this tail. Then $d(W, C) > 0$, but $\lim_\beta d(W, C_\beta) = 0$. This contradicts (b). Hence we have (b) $\Rightarrow$ (c); this also shows (b) $\Rightarrow$ (d). By Proposition 2.3(a), (c) $\Rightarrow$ (a) and (d) $\Rightarrow$ (a) follows from Proposition 2.3(a) and Proposition 1.1. ■

Corollary 3.6. *If B_{X^*} is w^* -sequentially compact, then each of (a)—(d) in Theorem 3.5 is equivalent to the following condition.*

Sequential Wijsman convergence implies Mosco convergence in X .

Proof. This follows from Theorem 3.5, Proposition 2.3(a) and Corollary 1.2. ■

Corollary 3.7. *For a Banach space X , the following are equivalent.*

- (a) *B_{X^*} is sequentially compact and sequential Wijsman and slice convergence coincide.*
- (b) *In any subspace of X , Wijsman and slice convergence coincide.*
- (c) *X is Asplund and Wijsman and weak compact gap convergence coincide.*
- (d) *$X \not\supset \ell_1$ and Wijsman convergence implies Mosco convergence.*
- (e) *B_{X^*} is w^* -sequentially compact, X does not contain an isomorphic copy of ℓ_1 and sequential Wijsman convergence implies Mosco convergence.*

Proof. Using Theorem 1.4, Proposition 2.3, Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 3.5, one can see that each of (a)—(e) is equivalent to the norm on X^* being w^* -Kadec. ■

On one hand, Corollary 3.7 shows that for a fixed norm on an Asplund space, Wijsman convergence implies Mosco convergence if and only if Wijsman and slice convergence

coincide. On the other hand, this does not mean that a sequence of sets converges slice if and only if it converges Mosco and Wijsman (even in Asplund spaces). Indeed, [BL, Theorem 6] shows that any separable Banach space can be renormed so that a decreasing sequence of subspaces converges Wijsman and Mosco but not slice. However, it is not clear to us whether C_n converges slice to C whenever $X \not\hookrightarrow \ell_1$ and C_n converges weak compact gap to C .

In light of Corollary 3.7, let us mention that there are spaces that are neither Asplund nor Schur which can be renormed so that the dual norm is w^* - τ -Kadec.

Example 3.8. *Let Ω be a σ -finite measure space, then there is a dual w^* - τ -Kadec norm on $L_1(\Omega)^*$.*

Proof. According to [BF2, Theorem 2.4], there is a norm on $L_1(\Omega)$ whose dual norm is w^* - τ -Kadec, in fact it is locally uniformly Mackey rotund. ■

We need some more terminology before we can present further corollaries of Theorems 3.2 and 3.5. A norm $\|\cdot\|$ is said to be *locally uniformly rotund* (LUR) if $\|x_n - x\| \rightarrow 0$ whenever $2\|x_n\|^2 + 2\|x\|^2 - \|x_n + x\|^2 \rightarrow 0$. It follows immediately from the definitions that a dual LUR norm is w^* -Kadec. On the other hand, the dual norm to the usual supremum norm on c_0 is w^* -Kadec but not LUR. For a Banach space X one can define a metric ρ on the space P of all equivalent norms on X as follows. Fix a norm on X with unit ball B_1 . For $\mu, \nu \in P$, define $\rho(\mu, \nu) = \sup\{|\nu(x) - \mu(x)| : x \in B_1\}$. It is shown in [FZZ], that (P, ρ) is a Baire space.

Corollary 3.9. *If X admits a norm for which Wijsman convergence implies slice (Mosco) convergence, then the collection of norms on X for which Wijsman convergence implies slice (weak compact gap) convergence is residual in (P, ρ) .*

Proof. The proof of [FZZ, Theorem 2] shows that if the set of norms on X whose duals are w^* -Kadec (w^* - τ -Kadec) is nonempty, then it is residual in (P, ρ) . This with Theorems 3.2 and 3.5 proves the corollary. ■

Corollary 3.10. *If X is a WCG Banach space, then the following are equivalent.*

- (a) X is Asplund.
- (b) There is a residual collection of norms in (P, ρ) for which Wijsman convergence implies slice convergence (in any subspace of X).
- (c) $X \not\hookrightarrow \ell_1$ and there is an equivalent norm on X for which sequential Wijsman convergence implies Mosco convergence.

Proof. (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b): It follows from [F1, Theorem 1], that there is a norm on X whose dual is LUR. Hence [FZZ, Theorem 2] shows that the collection of norms with dual LUR norms is residual in (P, ρ) . Invoking Theorem 3.2 shows that (b) holds.

Clearly (b) $\Rightarrow$ (c). Also, B_{X^*} is w^* -sequentially compact, because X is WCG (see [Di, p. 228]). From this and Corollary 3.7 we conclude that (c) $\Rightarrow$ (a). ■

A *weakly countably determined* (WCD) space is a more general type of space than WCG spaces; see [DGZ, Chapter VI] and [F2] for further details and note that [F2] uses the term *Vařák* space instead of WCD space.

Corollary 3.11. *Suppose X is a Banach space such that X^* is WCD. Then there is a residual collection of norms in (P, ρ) for which Wijsman and slice convergence coincide.*

Proof. According to [F2, Theorem 3] and [FZZ, Theorem 2], the collection of norms on X with dual LUR norms is residual in (P, ρ) . ■

In Remark 3.14 it is observed that there are non-WCG Asplund spaces which cannot be renormed so that Wijsman and slice convergence coincide. So the assumption that X is WCG in Corollary 3.10 is not extraneous. Moreover, there are non-WCG spaces X such that X^* is WCG ([JL]) so Corollary 3.11 covers some cases not included in Corollary 3.10.

The following theorem shows that if we put some restrictions on the limit set C , we can obtain slice convergence from Wijsman convergence in spaces whose dual spaces need not admit any sequentially w^* -Kadec dual norm; see Remark 3.14. Recall that a Banach space is said to have the *Radon-Nikodým property* (RNP) if every closed convex subset has slices of arbitrarily small diameter. See [Bou] for a comprehensive treatment of RNP spaces.

Theorem 3.12. *Suppose the norm $\|\cdot\|$ on X is Fréchet differentiable and let $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be a convex ℓ sc function such that $\lim_{\|x\| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(x)}{\|x\|} = \infty$. Suppose further that f_α are ℓ sc convex functions such that epif_α converges Wijsman to epif in $Y = X \times \mathbb{R}$ endowed with the ℓ_2 product of the norms.*

- (a) *If X has the RNP, then epif_α converges slice to epif .*
- (b) *If f has weakly compact level sets, then epif_α converges slice to epif .*

Proof. (a) If $\text{epif} = \emptyset$, then the result is clear. Thus we may assume that f is proper. So let $f(x_0) < +\infty$. By [Ph, Proposition 3.15], f has an ϵ -subgradient at x_0 . Using this with the fact that there is an n for which $f(x) \geq 0$ whenever $\|x\| \geq n$, one can show easily that f is bounded below.

Since f is bounded below, we assume (by making appropriate translations) that $f \geq 0$ and $f(0) < 1$. Let us first deal with a sequence $\{f_n\}$ such that $\text{epi} f_n$ converges Wijsman to $\text{epi} f$. Let $C_n = \text{epi} f_n$ and $C = \text{epi} f$. As in the proof of Theorem 3.2, it suffices to prove (ii) in Proposition 3.1 in order to show that C_n converges slice to C .

So let $y_0^* \in S_{Y^*}$ attain its supremum on C . Now write $y_0^* = (x_0^*, t_0)$ such that $x_0^* \in X^*$ and $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Since C is an epigraph of a function on X and y_0^* is bounded above on C , it follows that $t_0 \leq 0$. Let $\Lambda_n = (x_0^*, t_0 - \frac{1}{n})$. Then $t_0 - \frac{1}{n} \leq -\frac{1}{n}$ and since we assumed $f \geq 0$, we have

$$\sup_C \Lambda_n \leq \sup_C y_0^* \quad \text{for all } n. \quad (3.6)$$

Moreover,

$$\|\Lambda_n - y_0^*\| = \frac{1}{n} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Lambda_n\| \leq 1 + \frac{1}{n}. \quad (3.7)$$

Using the growth assumption on f , we choose $a_n \geq 2$ such that $f(x) \geq 8n\|x\|$ whenever $\|x\| \geq a_n$. Define the sets D_n by

$$D_n = C \cap \{(x, r) : x \in X \text{ and } r \leq 8na_n + 2\}$$

and let $d_n = \sup\{\|y\| : y \in D_n\}$. Note that D_n is bounded and $(0, 1) \in D_n$ so that $d_n \geq 1$. Because $Y = X \times \mathbb{R}$ has the RNP, according to [Bou, Corollary 3.5.7], we can choose $v_n^* \in Y^*$ such that

$$\|v_n^* - \Lambda_n\| \leq \frac{1}{nd_n}, \quad (3.8)$$

and moreover v_n^* attains its supremum on both B_Y and D_n , say,

$$\sup_{D_n} v_n^* = \langle v_n^*, y_n \rangle \quad \text{where } y_n = (x_n, r_n) \in D_n. \quad (3.9)$$

From (3.8), one has

$$\sup_{D_n} v_n^* \leq \sup_{D_n} \Lambda_n + \frac{1}{n}. \quad (3.10)$$

Writing $v_n^* = (x_n^*, t_n)$, we have $-1 - \frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{nd_n} \leq t_n \leq -\frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{nd_n}$, and so for $n \geq 2$, we have $t_n \geq -2$. From now on, for convenience, we will assume that $n \geq 2$. Since $(0, 1) \in D_n$, one has

$$\langle v_n^*, (0, 1) \rangle = \langle x_n^*, 0 \rangle + t_n \geq -2 \quad \text{and thus } \sup_{D_n} v_n^* \geq -2. \quad (3.11)$$

If $r_n \geq 8na_n$, then because $t_n \leq -\frac{1}{2n}$ we have

$$-2 \leq \langle v_n^*, (x_n, r_n) \rangle = \langle x_n^*, x_n \rangle + r_n t_n \leq 2\|x_n\| - 8na_n \frac{1}{2n}$$

and so

$$2a_n < -2 + 4a_n \leq 2\|x_n\| \quad \text{that is} \quad \|x_n\| > a_n.$$

But, by the choice of a_n , if $\|x_n\| \geq a_n$, then $r_n \geq f(x_n) \geq 8n\|x_n\|$ and consequently

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v_n^*, (x_n, r_n) \rangle &\leq \langle x_n^*, x_n \rangle - \frac{1}{2n} 8n\|x_n\| \\ &\leq 2\|x_n\| - 4\|x_n\| < -2. \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts (3.11). Thus we have $r_n \leq 8na_n$.

Recall that v_n^* attains its norm on B_Y . Now let $v_n = (\tilde{x}_n, \tilde{r}_n)$ be such that $\|v_n - y_n\| = 1$ and

$$\langle v_n^*, v_n - y_n \rangle = \|v_n^*\|. \quad (3.12)$$

Observe that $\tilde{r}_n \leq r_n + 1 \leq 8na_n + 1$ and so if $(c, t) \in C$ and $\|(c, t) - (\tilde{x}_n, \tilde{r}_n)\| \leq 1$, then $t \leq 8na_n + 2$ which means $(c, t) \in D_n$. Since $d(v_n, D_n) \leq 1$, we have $d(v_n, D_n) = d(v_n, C)$ and moreover,

$$1 = \frac{1}{\|v_n^*\|} \langle v_n^*, v_n - y_n \rangle \leq \inf_C \frac{1}{\|v_n^*\|} \langle v_n^*, v_n - c \rangle \leq d(v_n, C) \leq \|v_n - y_n\| = 1.$$

Now let $\Lambda_{n,k} \in \partial d(\cdot, C_k)(v_n)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_k \langle \Lambda_{n,k}, y_n - v_n \rangle &\leq \limsup_k (d(y_n, C_k) - d(v_n, C_k)) \\ &= d(y_n, C) - d(v_n, C) = -1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\lim_k \langle \Lambda_{n,k}, v_n - y_n \rangle \rightarrow 1 = \langle \frac{v_n^*}{\|v_n^*\|}, y_n - v_n \rangle$. As $\|\Lambda_{n,k}\| \leq 1$ and $\|\cdot\|$ is Fréchet differentiable, from Šmulyan's criterion (see [DGZ, Theorem I.1.4]), one obtains

$$(i) \lim_k \left\| \Lambda_{n,k} - \frac{v_n^*}{\|v_n^*\|} \right\| = 0 \quad \text{and in particular} \quad (ii) \lim_k \langle \Lambda_{n,k}, v_n \rangle = \frac{1}{\|v_n^*\|} \langle v_n^*, v_n \rangle. \quad (3.13)$$

Let $z_k \in C_k$ be arbitrary, because $\Lambda_{n,k} \in \partial d(\cdot, C_k)(v_n)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_k \langle \Lambda_{n,k}, z_k - v_n \rangle &\leq \limsup_k (d(z_k, C_k) - d(v_n, C_k)) \\ &= -d(v_n, C) = -1. \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

Consequently, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\limsup_k \langle \Lambda_{n,k}, z_k \rangle &\leq \limsup_k \langle \Lambda_{n,k}, v_n \rangle - 1 && [\text{by (3.14)}] \\
&= \frac{1}{\|v_n^*\|} \langle v_n^*, v_n \rangle - 1 && [\text{by (3.13(ii))}] \\
&= \frac{1}{\|v_n^*\|} [\langle v_n^*, v_n \rangle - \|v_n^*\|] \\
&= \frac{1}{\|v_n^*\|} \langle v_n^*, y_n \rangle && [\text{by (3.12)}] \\
&= \frac{1}{\|v_n^*\|} \sup_{D_n} v_n^* && [\text{by (3.9)}] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\|v_n^*\|} \left[\sup_{D_n} \Lambda_n + \frac{1}{n} \right] && [\text{by (3.10)}] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\|v_n^*\|} \left[\sup_C y_0^* + \frac{1}{n} \right]. && [\text{by (3.6)}]
\end{aligned}$$

This with (3.13(i)) shows that there exists $k_n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that whenever $k \geq k_n$ one has:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{C_k} \Lambda_{n,k} &\leq \sup_C y_0^* + \left(\frac{1}{\|v_n^*\|} - 1 \right) \sup_C y_0^* + \frac{1}{n\|v_n^*\|} + \frac{1}{n}, \quad \text{and} \\
\|\Lambda_{n,k} - y_0^*\| &\leq \left\| \Lambda_{n,k} - \frac{v_n^*}{\|v_n^*\|} \right\| + \left\| \frac{v_n^*}{\|v_n^*\|} - y_0^* \right\| \leq \frac{1}{n} + \left\| \frac{v_n^*}{\|v_n^*\|} - y_0^* \right\|.
\end{aligned}$$

By replacing k_n with a larger number in necessary, we may assume $k_n > k_{n-1}$ for all n . For $k < k_2$, let $y_k^* = 0$ and for $k_n \leq k < k_{n+1}$ let $y_k^* = \Lambda_{n,k}$. According to (3.7) and (3.8), $\|v_n^*\| \rightarrow 1$ and $\|v_n^* - y_0^*\| \rightarrow 0$. Thus it is clear from the above inequalities that $\|y_k^* - y_0^*\| \rightarrow 0$ and

$$\limsup_k \left\{ \sup_{C_k} y_k^* \right\} \leq \sup_C y_0^*.$$

Therefore $\text{epi} f_n$ converges slice to $\text{epi} f$. The statement for nets follows from Theorem 2.2 since the RNP and Fréchet differentiable norms are inherited by subspaces. This completes the proof of (a).

(b) Notice that the RNP was used only to obtain a dense set of functionals which simultaneously support D_n and B_Y . Since the level sets of f are assumed to be weakly compact, it follows that every functional attains its supremum on D_n . Hence by the Bishop-Phelps theorem there is a dense set of support functionals which simultaneously support D_n and B_Y . Therefore (b) follows from the proof of (a). ■

By considering indicator functions in the above theorem, we immediately obtain the following result.

Corollary 3.13. (a) Suppose X has the RNP and its norm is Fréchet differentiable. If C is a closed bounded convex set and C_α converges Wijsman to C , then C_α converges slice to C .

(b) Suppose the norm on X is Fréchet differentiable and C is weakly compact. If C_α converges Wijsman to C , then C_α converges slice to C .

Remark 3.14. There are spaces admitting Fréchet differentiable norms for which there is no equivalent norm such that Wijsman and slice convergence coincide. Indeed $C[0, \omega_1]$, admits a Fréchet differentiable norm ([Ta, Theorem 4]), while the techniques of [Ta, Theorem 3] can be used to show $C[0, \omega_1]^*$ does not admit any dual sequentially w^* -Kadec norm. Hence it is necessary to have restrictions on the limit set in Theorem 3.12 and Corollary 3.13. Also, any space with a separable second dual is an example of a space with the RNP that admits a Fréchet differentiable norm.

Finally, let us mention that one can use subdifferential techniques as in the proof of Theorem 3.12 to show that Wijsman and slice convergence coincide if the dual norm is LUR. This proof is somewhat simpler than the w^* -Kadec case. Also, similar techniques can be used to provide a simple direct proof that Wijsman convergence implies Mosco convergence when the dual norm is w^* - τ -Kadec; moreover, the proof of [Be2, Theorem 2.5], without modification, shows this result. However, these proofs do not appear to provide the additional information that Wijsman and weak compact gap convergence coincide in this case. As a follow up to the question stated at the end of Section 1, we should mention that we don't know if sequential Wijsman convergence implies slice convergence provided the dual norm is only assumed to be sequentially w^* -Kadec.

References

- [AB] H. Attouch and G. Beer, On the convergence of subdifferentials of convex functions, *Sem. d'Anal. Convexe Montpellier* **21** (1991) Exposé N° 8 (to appear in *Arch. Mat.*).
- [Be1] G. Beer, Convergence of continuous linear functionals and their level sets, *Arch. Math.* **52** (1989), 482–491.
- [Be2] G. Beer, Mosco convergence and weak topologies for convex sets and functions, *Mathematika* **38** (1991), 89–104.
- [Be3] G. Beer, The slice topology, a viable alternative to Mosco convergence in nonreflexive spaces, *J. Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods, Appl.* **19** (1992), 271–290.
- [Be4] G. Beer, Wijsman convergence of convex sets under renorming, preprint.
- [BB1] G. Beer and J.M. Borwein, Mosco convergence and reflexivity, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **109** (1990), 427–436.

- [BB2] G. Beer and J. Borwein, Mosco convergence of level sets and graphs of linear functionals, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* (in press).
- [BP] E. Bishop and R.R. Phelps, The support functionals of a convex set, *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, Vol. VII, pp. 27–35, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, Rhode Island, 1963.
- [Bor] J.M. Borwein, Asplund spaces are “sequentially reflexive”, preprint.
- [BFa] J.M. Borwein and M. Fabian, On convex functions having points of Gateaux differentiability which are not points of Fréchet differentiability, preprint.
- [BFV] J.M. Borwein, M. Fabian and J. Vanderwerff, Locally Lipschitz functions and bornological derivatives, preprint.
- [BF1] J.M. Borwein and S. Fitzpatrick, Mosco convergence and the Kadec property, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **106** (1989), 843–851.
- [BF2] J.M. Borwein and S. Fitzpatrick, A weak Hadamard smooth renorming of $L_1(\Omega, \mu)$, *Canad. Math. Bull.* (in press).
- [BL] J.M. Borwein and A.S. Lewis, Convergence of decreasing sequences of convex sets in nonreflexive Banach spaces, preprint.
- [Bou] R.D. Bourgin, *Geometric Aspects of Convex Sets with the Radon-Nikodým Property*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **993**, Springer-Verlag, 1983.
- [DGZ] R. Deville, G. Godefroy and V. Zizler, *Smoothness and Renormings in Banach Spaces*, Longman Monographs in Pure and Applied Mathematics (to appear).
- [Di] J. Diestel, *Sequences and Series in Banach Spaces*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **93**, Springer-Verlag, 1984.
- [Du] D. v. Dulst, *Characterizations of Banach Spaces not Containing ℓ^1* , CWI Tract, Amsterdam, 1989.
- [DS] D. v. Dulst and I. Singer, On Kadec-Klee norms on Banach spaces, *Studia Math.* **54** (1976), 203–211.
- [F1] M. Fabian, Each weakly countably determined Asplund space admits a Fréchet differentiable norm, *Bull. Austral. Math. Soc.* **36** (1987), 367–374.
- [F2] M. Fabian, On a dual locally uniformly rotund norm on a dual Vařák space, *Studia Math.* **101** (1991), 69–81.
- [FZZ] M. Fabian, L. Zajíček and V. Zizler, On residuality of the set of rotund norms on a Banach space, *Math. Ann.* **258** (1982), 349–351.
- [GM] N. Ghoussoub and B. Maurey, The asymptotic-norming property and the Radon-Nikodym properties are equivalent in separable Banach spaces, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **94** (1985), 665–671.
- [JH] R.C. James and A. Ho, The asymptotic-norming and Radon-Nikodym properties for Banach spaces, *Ark. Mat.* **19** (1981), 53–70.
- [JL] W.B. Johnson and J. Lindenstrauss, Some remarks on weakly compactly generated Banach spaces, *Israel J. Math.* **17** (1974), 219–230.
- [LP] D.G. Larman and R.R. Phelps, Gateaux differentiability of convex functions on Banach spaces, *J. London Math. Soc.* **20** (1979), 115–127.
- [M] U. Mosco, Convergence of convex sets and of solutions of variational inequalities, *Adv. Math.* **3** (1969), 510–585.
- [Ø] P. Ørno, On J. Borwein’s concept of sequentially reflexive Banach spaces, preprint.

- [Ph] R.R. Phelps, *Convex functions, monotone operators and differentiability*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **1364**, Springer-Verlag, 1989.
- [Ta] M. Talagrand, Renormages de quelques $C(K)$, *Israel J. Math.* **54** (1986), 327–334.
- [Tr] S. Troyanski, On a property of the norm which is close to local uniform rotundity, *Math. Ann.* **271** (1985), 305–313.
- [W] R. Wijsman, Convergence of sequences of convex sets, cones and functions, II, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **123** (1966), 32–45.